

Subj 17
C1
compl.

(d) a switching box for switching said input data from said local input device and from said remote input platform to said input device port.

33. The system of claim 32, wherein said main computer features a main radiowave receiver for receiving radiowaves from said remote input platform.

34. The system of claim 33, wherein said switching box features a main radiowave receiver for receiving radiowaves from said remote input platform, said switching box passing said radiowaves to said main computer.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are in this case. Claims 1-7 and 9-17 have been rejected. Claims 1-7 and 9-17 have now been canceled without prejudice. New claims 18-34 have been added.

The claims before the Examiner are directed toward a remote display device for a computer system, or a computer system including such a display, in which the computer monitor which actually provides the display to the user can be physically separated from the computer, with those parts of the computer with which the user interacts. Therefore, the computer system (or the

remote display device for such a system) clearly provides a separable system of components. The claimed computer system, and the remote display device which may be used in such a system, differ from the conventional, prior art, computer systems in that the communication between the main computer unit (which includes the CPU) on one hand, and the computer monitor and the input devices on the other hand, can also operate in a wireless mode. To efficiently effect such wireless connection data, compression and expansion techniques are preferably employed.

The present invention as claimed differs from the cited prior art in that the display device is a computer monitor. At the time of filing of the present application, computer monitors were not capable of wireless communication with the remaining components of the computer. Therefore, such computer monitors were not removable and could not be placed in a physically remote location from the remaining computer components.

By contrast, the cited prior art teaches supporting communication between two otherwise independent appliances (i.e., a computer and a television set) via a wireless network. This differs from the present invention in a number of respects. Television sets are inherently capable of receiving broadcast signals; at the time of filing of the present application, computer monitors lacked this capability. Furthermore, a computer and a television set together do not form a single interconnected appliance. The present invention teaches such an interconnected appliance, which collectively forms a computer.

Thus, the present invention is clearly different from the cited prior art, both as described and as claimed in the present application.

35 U.S.C. § 112 First Paragraph Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 and 9-17 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejected the recitation of receiving signals directly and not via a network.

While continuing to traverse the rejections of the Examiner, Applicant has chosen to cancel claims 1-7 and 9-17 without prejudice, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application. Applicant feels that these cancellations without prejudice overcome the rejections of the Examiner in this regard. Applicant further notes that new claims 18-34 do not recite this limitation.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections - Yiu and Phan

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10-12 and 14-17 under § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yiu and Phan. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10-12 and 14-17 have now been canceled without prejudice. New claims 18-34 have been added.

Yiu and Phan both clearly teach systems in which a television set has been connected to a computer. As noted above, television sets are inherently capable of receiving broadcast signals. Furthermore, the taught combination of a computer and a television set results in a home entertainment system, but certainly does not produce an integrated computer, since computers and television sets are each clearly independent appliances.

New independent claim 18 now includes the following limitations, which were not present in original claim 1, that clearly distinguish the recited device from the teachings of Yiu and Phan, alone or in combination. Claim 18 recites that the device comprises a computer monitor, rather than a remote display device. Furthermore, claim 18 also recites that the main computer, the computer monitor and the remote input platform in combination form a computer, and that the computer monitor and the remote input platform are physically separable from the main computer.

As noted above, at the time of filing the present application, computer monitors were not capable of receiving broadcast, wireless signals. By contrast, such a characteristic is required by the teachings of Yiu and Phan, in that they teach a television set as a remotely located device for displaying visual information, which is inherently capable of receiving broadcast signals. New independent claim 18 recites that the main computer is in contact with a computer monitor and a remote input platform, through a transmitter and a receiver. Thus, broadcasting of signals is clearly required by the present invention, and reception of those signals by the computer monitor is also

clearly required. Yet, Yiu and Phan actually teach away from these requirements.

Furthermore, claim 18 now recites that the main computer, the computer monitor and the remote input platform in combination form a computer, and that the computer monitor and the remote input platform are physically separable from the main computer, yet collectively form a computer. This point is made explicitly in the present application, on page 7 line 21-end, bridging to page 8, lines 1-2:

Thus, the portions of the computer with which the user directly interacts, the A/V display device and the input platform, can be remote devices, potentially physically separated from the main portion of the main computer (including the CPU).

None of these features are taught or suggested by Yiu and Phan, alone or in combination. In fact, again Yiu and Phan teach away from these features. Yiu and Phan teach the combination of a computer and a television set, which forms a home entertainment system but certainly does not form a computer. Yiu and Phan certainly do not teach or suggest that a remote input platform and a computer monitor could be physically separable from the main computer.

Furthermore, Applicant notes that the present invention can be characterized by the relative simplicity and efficiency of the combined components. Unlike the teachings of Yiu and Phan, the present invention does not require a television set or other expensive receiving device for the broadcast signals. Thus, the present invention provides the computer with

physically separable components by using a computer monitor, which is a simpler device.

Claim 31 recites a system, with similar limitations as for claim 18, and in addition recites the presence of two video cards. On page 5 of the office action, the Examiner states that "computers of this type contain plural video cards and an operating system to process and manipulate them". Applicant specifically traverses this recitation of the Examiner, and kindly requests the Examiner to provide a reference to this effect, as well as the connection between such a reference and the teachings of Yiu and Phan. As noted above, Yiu and Phan teach a home entertainment system, not a computer having physically separable components.

Ample support is found in the specification for the new claims. In particular, support for new claims 18-34 can be found in original claims 1-17. Support for the recitation of the device comprising a computer monitor can be found on page 9, line 6. Support for the recitation that the main computer, the computer monitor and the remote input platform in combination form a computer can be found on page 3, lines 13-20. Support for the recitation that the computer monitor and the remote input platform are physically separable from the main computer can be found on page 7, lines 21-end, bridging to page 8, lines 1- 2.

Applicant strongly believes that new independent claims 18 and 31 are not rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Yiu and Phan, because neither Yiu nor Phan teach the remote placement of a computer monitor from a

main computer; rather they teach networking two individual appliances, one of which, a television set, is inherently capable of receiving broadcasts, unlike a computer monitor.

Thus, amended independent claims 18 and 31 are allowable, rendering dependent claims 19-29 and 31-34, which directly or indirectly depend therefrom, also allowable.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections - Yiu, Phan and Yen

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 under § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yiu and Phan and further in view of Yen.

While continuing to traverse the rejections of the Examiner in this regard, Applicant has chosen to cancel these claims without prejudice in order to expedite the prosecution.

New independent claims 18 and 31 recite limitations which clearly distinguish over Yiu and Phan, as well as over Yen, rendering the dependent claims also allowable over Yiu, Phan and Yen, alone or in combination.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections - Yiu, Phan and Hare et al.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yiu and Phan and further in view of Hare et al.

While continuing to traverse the rejections of the Examiner in this regard, Applicant has chosen to cancel this claim without prejudice in order to expedite the prosecution.

New independent claims 18 and 31 recite limitations which clearly distinguish over Yiu and Phan, as well as over Hare et al., rendering the dependent claims also allowable over Yiu, Phan and Hare et al., alone or in combination.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 18-34 are now in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Sol Sheinbein
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,457

Date: October 28, 2002